1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT CO	YORK x
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	United States Courthouse
4		Brooklyn, New York
5	-versus-	July 15, 2022 10:30 a.m.
6	GENARO GARCIA LUNA,	10.00 a.m.
7	Defendant.	
8		x
9	BEFORE THE	INAL CAUSE FOR STATUS CONFERENCE HONORABLE BRIAN M. COGAN STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	APPEARANCES	
12		UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
13	ror the Government:	Eastern District of New York 271 Cadman Plaza East
14		Brooklyn, New York 11201 BY: SARITHA KOMATIREDDY, ESQ. RYAN C. HARRIS, ESQ.
15		ERIN REID, ESQ. Assistant United States Attorneys
16	For the Defendant:	BY: CESAR DECASTRO, ESQ.
17	ror the berendant.	SHANNON MCMANUS, ESQ.
18	Also Present:	Estrellita Plested, Interpreter Maristela Verastegui, Interpreter
19	Court Reporter:	Rivka Teich, CSR, RPR, RMR, FCRR
20	1	Phone: 718-613-2268 Email: RivkaTeich@gmail.com
21	Proceedings recorded by	
22	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.	
23		
24		
25		

1	(Video conference.)		
2	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All Rise. 19-CR-576, United		
3	States vs. Genaro Luna.		
4	State your name for the record, starting with the		
5	Government.		
6	MS. KOMATIREDDY: Good morning, your Honor. This is		
7	Saritha Komatireddy for the United States. I'm joined in my		
8	office by AUSAs Ryan Harris, Erin Reid and Philip Pilmar.		
9	MR. DE CASTRO: Good morning, your Honor. Cesar de		
10	Castro and Shannon McManus for Mr. Garcia Luna.		
11	THE COURT: Good morning, all. I see Mr. Garcia		
12	Luna is present. Good morning, sir.		
13	I'll first note for the record that we have a		
14	Spanish interpreter interpreting for Mr. Garcia Luna, who has		
15	been previously sworn.		
16	The first order of business is that I assume		
17	everyone is consenting to doing what is a fairly routine		
18	status conference by video; is that correct?		
19	I'll hear from the Government first after the		
20	translation.		
21	MS. KOMATIREDDY: Yes, your Honor.		
22	THE COURT: Mr. De Castro?		
23	MR. DE CASTRO: Yes, I discussed it with		
24	Mr. Garcia Luna, and he knows of his rights to be in person.		
25	We both would prefer that this be in video today.		

2.3

THE COURT: Because this is a routine status conference, I don't think I need to make a finding under the CARES Act. I will simply note that everyone has consented to proceeding by video.

I have the Government's agenda letter. I think it's self-explanatory. Clearly one of the things we still need to talk about is a schedule for jury questionnaires. Is there any chance that the parties have discussed or even agreed upon a schedule?

MS. KOMATIREDDY: Your Honor, as an initial matter, I think it would be helpful to get some guidance from the Court on whether the Court would like to do the jury questionnaire administration distribution and the individual voir dire starting on October 24 or in advance of that and work backwards.

THE COURT: My experience is that it's a multi-week process. If we were to start on October 24, we wouldn't start trial for a minimum of two or three weeks after that, and since we have time, I'd like to front-load it. So let me propose a timetable and tell me what you think of it.

MR. DE CASTRO: Your Honor, if I may, before we go there, if that's okay.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. DE CASTRO: I think maybe it makes sense also, because one of the issues I wanted to raise today was whether

we think this can get done in October in the first place. I think maybe that conversation -- we should have that first.

THE INTERPRETER: The interpreter requests the repetition of the last part.

MR. DE CASTRO: Whether we can get this done in October, which is our current trial date.

THE COURT: Okay. Tell me, Mr. De Castro.

MR. DE CASTRO: When the Court set October 24 as the trial date, it also set January 9 as a backup trial date, and I think the Court stated, if I recall correctly, the reason for that and we all agreed that there was a lot to do before that date we weren't sure if we would be able to accomplish everything in time.

I alerted the Government, I think, last week. We talked a little bit informally earlier this week that my view is that, given the current circumstances, that we were more on track for the backup trial date than we were the October trial date. My understanding is that the Government wants to keep the October trial date, but my view is that the backup trial date is much more realistic.

THE COURT: Before I hear from the Government, tell me why you think you can't meet the October 24 trial date.

MR. DE CASTRO: Sure. I think I should note first I'm just concerned about it. I'm not saying definitely no, but my feelings are that we're not getting there, and let me

tell you those reasons.

Some of those reasons are, first, in terms of materials that I need to review and my team needs to review. So the record is clear, we're — the Government has produced somewhere in the neighborhood of 1,070,000 pages of material plus audio and video. I certainly have had a lot of those materials for some time. But for context, just since February, the Government produced approximately 90,000 pages of material, plus they are starting to produce 3500 material. And one thing I've asked the Government is to give me an estimate as to the volume of that material. My understanding from the Government is that they are not able to tell me that, the volume of that material, partially because of maybe the way it's stamped. It's not, I guess, Bates—stamped per page.

So it's very hard for me to say how I'm going to review a volume of material that I know is voluminous, is the heart of the case, but I have no idea how much.

Furthermore, I know the Court has the Government's opening motions in limine. We have responded. But I anticipate that there probably will be some more motion practice depending on — at least from my side, depending on what I see in 3500, and, in fact, the Government in their motion said it was their first motions in limine. So I don't know if they anticipate a whole other round of motions in limine as well.

Of course, there's just our own defense witnesses, our own preparation, and the outstanding CIPA material that I have, of course, also no idea if those are materials that I have to review and do so in a whole other process.

And lastly, we also have to keep in mind that once I have the 3500 materials, I have to sit with Mr. Garcia Luna — or someone does — to review it with him. He's not permitted to have it. And if we don't know what that volume is, I have no idea how long that will take and I have no idea — I have to manage that with the never-ending lockdowns of the MDC.

THE COURT: Remind me, Mr. De Castro: Do you have any support helping you with these tasks besides Mr. McManus?

MR. DE CASTRO: I do, your Honor. On the financial piece of it, which is a volume of material, there's someone there. And then I have a paralegal. Another lawyer,

Ms. Gottlieb, is not here today. She's traveling. She's on the case as well.

THE COURT: And Ms. Komatireddy, what is your concern slipping to January 9?

MS. KOMATIREDDY: Your Honor, we have several concerns. At the outset, we oppose having an adjournment, in part because this trial date was set significantly in advance in order to account for all of the issues that Mr. De Castro just delineated.

First of all, with respect to the materials that

have been turned over, as Mr. De Castro noted, those million pages were turned over -- most of them were turned over a significant amount of time ago. Since February, while there have been approximately 90,000 pages of material turned over, most of them are bank records or early disclosure of 3500 material.

Second, with respect to whether the Government has additional motions in limine, I understand we did file on ECF that it was our first motions in limine, but that was just a matter of sort of how we ordinarily demarcate things. The parties jointly proposed a motion schedule in this case.

Those are our motions in limine. In every trial there are some additional motions that come up closer to the trial. I expect that will happen from both sides, but smaller evidentiary issues. With respect to our mainstay motions with respect to 404(b), et cetera, those are our primary motions in limine.

With respect to defense witnesses, I would note that the defense has had more than a year to get its own witnesses in order. I don't think that's a basis for delay.

And with respect to CIPA, I will be careful here, but I will note that my expectation is that once the CIPA process is completed, the disclosures will be manageable for the defense.

THE INTERPRETER: The interpreter would ask relief.

1 | Another interpreter has joined the conference.

THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead.

MS. KOMATIREDDY: Counsel requested the status of remaining 3500 in order to plan the trial date. We are in the process of obtaining a more accurate page count, but I think it's fair to say that we're looking at thousands of pages, not tens of thousands of pages, as well as some devices and recordings.

But our primary concern, your Honor — there are a couple of additional concerns. As your Honor is aware, witness security and movement in these kinds of cases is complicated and really does involve threats to life and limb. The Government has already begun moving witnesses and preparing in anticipation of an October trial date. We have particular concerns in light of counsel's filing earlier this week that when we turn over material, whether it be in discovery or 3500, or suggest what the evidence might be at trial as we did in our motions in limine, that counsel will then turn that around and file a brief, which he filed just a couple days ago, that calls out individuals that the defendant believes may be witnesses at trial and then engages in a character assassination of those individuals in order to dissuade them from being witnesses.

For that reason, although before this week we have approached this process with an intention to turn over 3500

months in advance of the trial, which we have already begun doing, in light of counsel's filing, regardless of when the trial date is, we are reluctant to turn over any 3500 until close to that trial date.

In short, the defendant should not be permitted more time to sit with the 3500 in order to either intimidate witnesses or try his case in the press before trying it in court.

MR. DE CASTRO: May I respond?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. DE CASTRO: First of all, I must respond when the Government is now accusing me of intimidating witnesses or attempting to do so by filing a response to its motions identifying these issues. They filed the motions. It's their issue about bringing these issues to light. Furthermore, it has nothing to do with 3500 material, so they're mixing that issue. It is completely a red herring.

On June 6, I ran into a member of the prosecution team and told them I did not believe we were headed towards an October trial when asked. Last week or the week before last, I spoke with Mr. Harris and specifically told him that I am not the type of lawyer that is going to game this and try to get all of their 3500 and then ask for an adjournment. I understand that when we talk about the trial date, it reflects when they will produce their 3500.

THE COURT: Mr. De Castro, before you go on, if I understand what you just said, it is that you expected if I kicked the trial date to January 9, that will co-extensively delay the Government's production of 3500 material. Is that what you're saying?

MR. DE CASTRO: Yes. And they have said all along -- and I think we've had a perfectly fine working relationship until they decided to attack me today -- was that they would try to produce any 3500 that didn't involve any sort of their view of sensitive material so that we could work towards that same trial date.

I think the other thing that is important to note is that still, sitting here today, they do not know the volume of 3500 material. It's bizarre to me. And second, my experience with 3500 material for 20 years is that it's largely single-spaced. So if we're talking about interviews, hundreds, if not thousands of pages of interview notes that are single-spaced that I have to review, we have to review with Mr. Garcia Luna that is the heart of the case, that is very significant.

What is extraordinary to me is that after trying this case already, or at least the large portion of these witnesses have already testified in a prior trial is my understanding, that they do not know the volume.

One last thing, Judge. My apologies. The

suggestion that — there was a suggestion that I'm somehow trying this case or affecting the press. I'd ask — I point out that they can Google or do whatever search they want and go look for all the quotes that Mr. De Castro gives in all of the hundreds of cases I've handled it would be on one hand. So I'm not doing anything in the press.

THE COURT: The case is in a little bit unusual of a position.

MS. KOMATIREDDY: I'm sorry to interrupt. I apologize to this. I'm told the public line is not working. I just wanted to raise it to the Court's attention.

THE COURT: If the public line is not working, what do the parties propose? We should proceed or reconvene?

MS. KOMATIREDDY: Your Honor, my proposal -- I don't know if it's something that Mr. Scott is able to fix it or not. My proposal would be to proceed and make the transcript available in an expedited fashion.

THE COURT: Is that okay with you, Mr. De Castro?

MR. DE CASTRO: That's fine with me, Judge.

THE COURT: Under the circumstances, especially considering that Mr. Garcia Luna is at the MDC and it's not easy to arrange either his presence or these videoconferences, we're going to proceed. I will ask the court reporter to please expedite preparation of the transcript from this conference so that the public can have the access that they

1 are supposed to.

Mr. De Castro, if I understood what you were saying at the beginning when you started to speak, it sounded like you are not at this time moving to adjourn the trial to the January 9 date. Or are you?

MR. DE CASTRO: I'm sorry. It's hard for me to say.

THE COURT: Let me put it this way. I took what you were saying to me that gives me a heads-up that it might come to that. Is that a fair characterization?

MR. DE CASTRO: Yes, Judge. I would characterize it as this: I gave the Government a heads-up that I need more information to be able to say I can do this in October. You know, they act like we didn't set a January 9 backup date. We did that. But then I think it's more like January 9. And they have provided no new information that tells me there is any chance I can do this in October. So, I mean, it's tough to say. I think there is no way -- I'm feeling like there's no way I can do this in October, given what they are just continuing to -- the representations they're making and the documents they're giving me.

I think as -- just to be safe, why don't we just keep the safe date that we've all -- I have blocked off both of them. There's not an issue, and we definitely should be prepared.

THE COURT: Let me ask you -- my other question,

Mr. De Castro, is the volume of the 3500 material is really not material to this decision, is it? Because, as you say, if we're going to adjourn the trial, then we're going to adjourn the production date for the 3500 material, and whether it's ten pages or 10 million pages, it won't materially affect the amount of time that you have to review that material.

Isn't that right?

MR. DE CASTRO: It does and it doesn't. The Government's prior position before today was they were going to try to get me 3500 as quickly as possible of lots of the witnesses so I would have been getting, I presume, a lot of them and then they would hold off on others.

Today their position is, well, now that you've filed a motion response, we're now going to give you 3500 whenever we decide to give it to you. So --

And, of course, as the Court knows, the -- their obligation is really to give it to me after the witnesses testify. So I'm in a really tough spot here.

THE COURT: One more question, Mr. De Castro. I don't know how much practice experience Mr. McManus or Ms. Gottlieb have. I will say Mr. McManus looks very young to me, but so do a lot of people.

Given the magnitude of this case, Mr. De Castro, would it assist you if I authorized under CJA either an additional senior attorney like yourself to be cocounsel or a

- 1 less experienced attorney to help with document review?
- 2 MR. DE CASTRO: Judge, I thought of that as well.
- 3 But then there is the process of just getting someone up to
- 4 | speed. It takes time. Ms. Gottlieb has been working with me
- 5 | since 2013, I believe, and has tried many cases with me.
- 6 | She's now a member of the Southern District of New York panel.
- 7 | We've tried six-month-long cases, two-month-long cases, and
- 8 two-day-long cases. She's very experienced.
- 9 Mr. McManus is young. He has life experience, some
- 10 prior to law school experience. He's two years out of Fordham
- 11 Law.
- 12 THE COURT: I'm reading your website.
- MR. DE CASTRO: And, Judge, of course I never turn
- 14 down help, number one. So yes, I would certainly welcome
- 15 that.
- 16 But it brings me back to, again, when we do get to
- 17 | 3500 production? What is the volume? If it's 100 pages,
- 18 | that's one thing. If it's tens of thousands, well, that could
- 19 | mean -- not tens of thousands. That could mean 9,000 pages.
- 20 I don't know what it is.
- 21 THE COURT: Okay. Here's what I'm going to do. I'm
- 22 | not going to rule on it at the moment. There are a couple of
- 23 | things I want to have happen.
- Number one, I'm going to direct the Government
- 25 | within the next ten days to give Mr. De Castro an estimate of

the volume of the 3500 material. That estimate is to be within a 10 to 15 percent margin of error.

Second, I am dubious about the Government's suggestion that Mr. De Castro may be taking advantage of the magnitude of the case in order either to discourage witnesses, although I know the Government is not ascribing that to him personally, or to allow more publicity about sensitive matters in the case.

I will say, Ms. Komatireddy, as Mr. De Castro pointed out, he kind of responded to the motion in limine that you filed. He didn't have much choice in that. I would suggest if there are any further such motions and the Government is concerned about that, one way to ameliorate, although I know not eliminate, the potential that the Government is concerned about is simply to use pseudonyms or numbers for these witnesses that come out in the pretrial motion practice.

I will also say in order to help me decide whether to adjourn the trial now or just leave it open as to whether we're going to adjourn the trial, if the Government really has more evidence than I've seen that there is a potential for witness discouragement, then I want an exparte affidavit on that in a week. Based on everything I've heard today, that, to me, would be the most important reason to keep the current trial date.

I do think if the Government has been able to keep its witnesses in the fold this long, then I don't think they are going to have a likelihood of losing them before January instead of end of October, unless I get a very specific showing from the Government.

So for now we're going to keep the present date.

But I will not be surprised if the case gets kicked to

January 9, based on what I'm hearing.

Mr. De Castro, if you need more help, send me an application. All right?

On the current assumption that we're going to keep the current schedule, let's talk about the jury questionnaires, which is where I started. I'd like an agreed-upon questionnaire on September 9. The parties can put into it whatever they want, but I would recommend, as is the case with these questionnaires, that we eliminate conflicts and incompatibility in the questionnaires. In other words, I don't want to hear a juror say to me, well, my employer will only pay for two weeks of jury duty. Let's screen that out. Let's also screen out things like it's my 50th wedding anniversary; I've got a prepaid trip to Paris.

If the parties can't agree on particular things that one side thinks should be in and the other should not, just mark it up and I'll rule on what you've submitted.

If we do that, and just in case there are any

disputes I have to resolve, we will have the questionnaires distributed to a potential jurors on the 19th of September. The jurors will fill those out in court either on the 19th, Monday, or maybe they will have to continue, depending how long they are, on Tuesday the 20th. The parties will then get those by the end of that week on the 23rd, and then by October 7th the best thing that could happen would be if they give me an agreed pool of people who should be called in. If they agree on enough people, then those will be the ones we call in. If they don't agree, then I'll have to reach into each side's proposals and decide — or maybe we'll just call in at random. I think that's better. We'll call in this random if they don't agree on a pool.

That means please don't put anyone in your proposed call in list that clearly has something that's going to take them out of this trial. If you get me that on the 7th, then we will have time, I believe. I'll check with the jury clerk office, but I believe the clerk will be able to call in or have everyone call in and check whether they should come in by the following weekend. That will be Sunday, the 16th. That will give them a week to clear their affairs and they'll be able to come in on the 24th for selection.

I will note that's just my proposal. If the parties want to do something different, they should talk to each other, and anything they agree to, as long as it doesn't jam

me or the jury selection department up too much, is probably going to be acceptable to me.

Anything else we need to cover today?

MS. KOMATIREDDY: Yes, your Honor.

First of all, with respect to the pending motions in limine, counsel filed his response on Wednesday, July 13. We don't have a reply date on the calendar. We would request July 27 for reply.

THE COURT: I think the local rules say seven days in the absence of a schedule set by the Court, but I have no problem giving you until the 27th.

MS. KOMATIREDDY: Thank you, Judge.

Eastly, we would just ask that the Court continue to exclude time and make a finding that there is still a good basis under the Speedy Trial Act for the exclusion of time between now and the current sort of trial October 24 based first on the pendency of motions in limina, second on the complexity of the case, and third on the defense counsel's stated need to prepare for trial.

THE COURT: I assume Mr. De Castro no opposition to excluding time.

MR. DE CASTRO: No opposition, Judge. I think you have excluded until the 24th. Anyway, you designated it complex, and I agree.

THE COURT: There are obviously ample grounds for

1	excluding time. All three of the reasons that the Government
2	stated: The complexity of the case, the pendency of motions,
3	and the need of defense counsel to do everything he can to
4	prepare.
5	Anything else from you, Mr. De Castro?
6	MR. DE CASTRO: No, Judge. Thank you.
7	THE COURT: Thank you all for calling in. We'll see
8	what happens with the trial date. Like I say, we'll keep the
9	current one for now, but it won't shock me if we let it slip.
10	We are adjourned.
11	(Whereupon, the matter was concluded.)
12	* * * *
13	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
14	
15	/s/ Rivka Teich Rivka Teich, CSR RPR RMR FCRR
16	Official Court Reporter Eastern District of New York
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
, ,	